DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 584 CS 502 474

AUTHOR Garrison, John P.
TITLE Consulting and Communication in Organizations.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Biloxi, Mississippi, April 11-14, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consultants; *Educational Research; *Evaluation; Higher Education; Identification; *Needs Assessment; *Organizational Communication; *Organizational Development; Problem Solving
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a recent program of organizational awareness and development (OAD) initiated for a university program council. It describes the nature, purposes, and objectives of OAD and its role as a third party. It also provides an example of applied communication research, divided into four phases: (1) diagnostic, (2) feedback, (3) intervention, and (4) evaluation. Each phase is discussed and a sample survey instrument is included. The paper concludes with implications for communication consultants and a copy of the actual summary report presented to the client organization. (Author/TJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED169584

CONSULTING AND COMMUNICATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

John P. Garrison

Auburn University and Learning Research Associates, Inc.

6030 Haley Center
Auburn, AL 36830

(205) 826-4682

5616 Dogwood Drive
Lincoln, NE 68516

(402) 489-3545

Abstract

This paper describes a recent program of organizational awareness and development (OAD) initiated for a university program council. It provides an example of applied communication research, divided into four phases: (1) diagnostic; (2) feedback; (3) intervention; and (4) evaluation. Each phase is discussed and a sample survey instrument is included. The paper concludes with implications for communication consultants and a copy of the actual summary report presented to the client organization.

Invited paper presented to the Southern Speech Communication Association, Biloxi, Mississippi, April 1979.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John P. Garrison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS502474

INTRODUCTION

OAD: A Program of Organizational Awareness and Development

An OAD program strives to accomplish primarily three objectives: (1) to help an organization become aware of its current structure (e.g., goals and effectiveness, reward structure, problem solving and decision making strategies, leadership styles, and interpersonal relationships); (2) to help the organization define and clarify its perceived problems; and finally, (3) to help the organization select appropriate alternative strategies to cope with both present and future problems. Clearly, OAD is not a prescriptive program. Rather, it seeks to help organizations define their own plans for coping with stress and change.

To accomplish these objectives, OAD is divided into four phases:

1. A Diagnostic Phase where members individually respond to a questionnaire and/or interview schedule designed to ascertain their perceptions of the organization's current structure and perceived problems

2. A Feedback Phase where a composite picture of the organization is fed back to its members for their deliberation

3. An Intervention Phase where techniques and strategies for dealing with current and future problems are designed, discussed, and implemented

4. An Evaluation Phase where the perceived effectiveness of specific interventions are ideally assessed on a continuous basis

OAD is not a one shot "miracle cure" program. It only proposes a method of diagnosing organizational problems and dealing with them. Obviously, problems change with time and so, of necessity, the methods for dealing with these problems must be continually up-dated by the organization itself -- long after the instigation of any OAD program. The effectiveness of any OAD program is ultimately determined by the willingness of participant members to critically examine themselves on a continuous basis.

NATURE AND PURPOSES OF ORGANIZATIONAL AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT (Nielsen, 1975)

Generally we think of organizations, such as UPC, as rational mechanisms for solving problems and producing services. We think of them as providing for specialization and division of labor, with direction and coordination achieved through staff management.

Common experience tells us that this rational model is far too simple. For example, two organizational segments which rationally should be supporting each other develop a parochialism and competitiveness. Decisions themselves may not be timely or are unrealistic.

On the interpersonal level, we are all familiar with the prevalence of ineffective conduct which is not rational for the organization and not helpful to the individual. For example, a chairperson's inability to listen to the members of his/her group may be demotivating them, but this data may not be shared with him/her because of the risk, or pessimism about his/her ability to respond positively. Or a member of the group may hide the fact that (s)he is getting into difficulty because (s)he fears that reporting it may make them appear incompetent. Or an apparently rational argument on technical merits may disguise an underlying competition.

These are examples of serious constraints on the effectiveness of a human system. They are also examples of conditions that cause many of our greatest personal frustrations. Yet many organizations are very ineffective in dealing with such problems. Often, we do not talk together about the problems we create for each other. Neither do we talk very fully about how we can be of more help to each other. We are often restricted by our lack of knowledge and skill about talking together, by our fear of the consequences for ourselves, our pessimism, our defensiveness, our need to be right, to appear competent, to be liked, and so on. Organizational Development methods are designed to provide means for working with such problems.

Rationality and Health in Organizations

A fundamental objective of OAD is to produce more rational, healthy organizations. The adjectives "rational" and "healthy" refer to the organization group's ability to know its "real world" and to respond vigorously to it.

A major focus of OAD, therefore, is on groups developing more complete data on their situation. The diagram below is illustrative of the field of data relevant to the functioning of an organization.

Data usually emphasized in organizational action.	Data receiving additional emphasis in OAD methods
Hard data, numbers, attendance, profit, objectives, technical issues, policies, procedures, organization structure, roles, individual performance, relations with staff, customers (e.g. public or student body etc.) formal structured group process, etc.	Feelings and potentially threatening opinions concerning: the same range of variables, plus additional emphasis on interpersonal relations, the impact of staff behavior, relating individual to organizational needs, informal group process, etc.

In applying OAD methods, as in a team-building meeting, the data and variables worked with should be appropriate to the needs and objectives of the group. One meeting may function largely on the left, "usual" side of the circle, and another, even of the same group, may function on the "additional emphasis" side.

Another way of saying this is that one meeting may be primarily "task" oriented and another primarily "process" oriented. For example, the task of the group might be to develop goals for the next year; the process of the meeting would be how that task is carried out. The general process of the meeting might be a simple information flow from and to the staff, or it might be a general debate on the merits of various goals. It might follow a definite and planned sequence of steps, or the group's mood of the moment. The nature of the interaction is part of the process, in this case the informal process. The underlying process can be disguised and subtle. For example, the person who chronically attacks the work of the group may be saying, at the level of his/her feelings, that (s)he does not feel accepted as a full member of the group.

A group dealing with its process is critiqueing the way it does its work, in a search for more effective alternatives.

Working with informal process leads naturally to feelings, which are a fundamental part of any group's process. We are often accustomed to relegating personal feelings to second priority in achieving the organization's goals. Practically, however, they are a highly important part of the data, and there are many organizational and personal benefits from working with them. It is not uncommon to find that organizations tend to dichotomize personal "process" and "task" functions. That is, an organization may periodically spend time on being "process-oriented", but then be forced back by time constraints into doing "its real business" (i.e., making decisions and completing tasks. However, it is the contention of OAD that these two functions are interdependent and, as such, they cannot be dichotomized very realistically or effectively. Therefore, whenever possible, OAD attempts to address both task and process functions.

Our Role As The Third Party

Persons who implement and facilitate OAD programs are known as "Third Parties." The third party in an OAD program is often called in by a group to help it explore its everyday functioning and to assist it in defining how it wishes to improve and how it will go about making the change. In short, we perceive our roles as change "facilitators," not change "dictators." Our goals are to guide you (the organization) toward more self-sufficient behavior in identifying and solving your own problems, not to make you dependent on us for decisions.

If we were to make a short checklist of what we do, it might look something like this: (Fordyce, 1971)

1. Diagnosis: Assist in diagnosing the current state of the organization in terms of its assumptions, values, internal and external relationships, ways of dealing with conflict, distribution and availability of resources, etc.

2. Feedback: Help improve the organization's effectiveness through the use of participant "feedback" and participant development.

3. Strategy: Help in planning strategies for dealing with problems.

4. Tactics: Aid in suggesting and planning specific steps for pursuing the strategy (e.g., plan a team-building meeting, set up a critical meeting between two parties).

5. Meeting Facilitating: Monitor meetings and intervene when the group is moving sluggishly on an OAD method (examples: Without being aware of it, a person may dominate a meeting and prevent the free flow of conversation. Or rational progress on a problem may be delayed by emotionally held fortresses. The Third Party perceives the difficulties and helps the group to overcome them.)

6. Risk-Taking: Take the risk of saying what no one else feels free to say.

7. Constructivism: Encourage the group toward constructive action.

8. Connection: Tie together the parties to the problem.

9. Alternatives: Introduce alternatives when conventional views of organizations and interpersonal relations blind participants to fresh possibilities.

10. Educate: Teach OAD methods to participants so that they can implement them on an on-going basis.

Final Note

Our original purpose in implementing an OAD program with UPC and its staff members was to complete a research project designed to study the feasibility of applying OAD methods to voluntary organizations, since little research has been done in this area. However, as we gradually found out more about UPC itself, the idea of working with your organization became intriguing. We perceive that UPC and its staff members are somewhat unique from other voluntary organizations in that its members generally appear to be quite willing and even insistent upon critically examining themselves both as individuals and as a functioning organization. As is the case with many voluntary organizations, UPC's rapid membership turnover each year presents an inherent stress on the organization's effectiveness. It is our sincere hope that the OAD methods used presently will give you some ideas to facilitate the orientation of new members as rapidly and effectively as possible. We look forward to working with you.

DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY

To: UPC Members

This diagnostic survey is the first phase of OAD (Organizational Awareness and Development). Your individual input into this phase of the program is very important in terms of providing UPC with an overall picture of itself. Remember that you are doing the actual analysis of UPC.

Please realize that the value of this survey depends upon your being frank and open in answering these questions. Clearly, these are not easy questions to deal with. Take time to think through your answers. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

In order to keep all responses in strictest confidence, we do not want any names or social security numbers on these questionnaires.

Immediately following the collection of this data, we will "feedback" a composite picture of the results to you for your use.

Sincerely,

Note: Read these items over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions using the following scales:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Most of the time
5. Always

1.	How often are the persons in UPC friendly and easy to approach?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	How often is your advisor friendly and easy to approach?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	How often must UPC work under more pressure than should be necessary?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	How often must problems become crises before efforts are made to resolve them?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	How often do you enjoy your work with UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	How often are you satisfied with your own performance in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	How often do chairpersons from different committees assist one another in their work?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	To what extent is your advisor receptive to your ideas and suggestions?	1	2	3	4	5
9.	To what extent are you more likely to hear about a change within UPC which will affect you from the "grapevine" than from your advisors?	1	2	3	4	5
10.	To what extent do you have the authority to make decisions you feel you should be making?	1	2	3	4	5
11.	To what extent do you <u>feel</u> a real responsibility to help UPC be successful?	1	2	3	4	5
12.	To what extent do you <u>assume</u> a real responsibility to help UPC be successful?	1	2	3	4	5

Note: Read these items over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions using the following scales:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Most of the time
5. Always

13. To what extent are work activities sensibly organized in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
14. To what extent is UPC generally quick to use improved work methods?	1	2	3	4	5
15. To what extent is your committee adequately budgeted for the tasks it must perform?	1	2	3	4	5
16. To what extent is your committee given enough time to complete tasks?	1	2	3	4	5
17. To what extent does your committee have the personnel with the expertise needed to perform tasks well?	1	2	3	4	5
18. To what extent are decisions in UPC adequately reviewed?	1	2	3	4	5
19. To what extent are improved work methods (such as suggestions coming out of orientation sessions) actually implemented?	1	2	3	4	5
20. To what extent are these improved work methods useful to you in your work with UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
21. Sometimes decisions are reviewed too much and their impact is weakened by the delay. To what extent are decisions reviewed too much in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
22. To what extent do you think UPC uses its time well in weekly meetings?	1	2	3	4	5
23. To what extent could you be making more decisions than you do now?	1	2	3	4	5
24. To what extent do UPC members criticize your suggestions before the idea is fully discussed?	1	2	3	4	5

Note: Read these items over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions using the following scales:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Most of the time
5. Always

25.	To what extent does your advisor effectively use informal, personalized, face-to-face communication?	1	2	3	4	5
26.	To what extent do you feel that your advisor is under a great deal of "time" pressure?	1	2	3	4	5
27.	To what extent do you feel your advisor has confidence and trust in you?	1	2	3	4	5
28.	To what extent do you have confidence and trust in your advisor?	1	2	3	4	5
29.	To what extent do you think your advisor is frank and honest in his/her reactions to you?	1	2	3	4	5
30.	To what extent does a general atmosphere of openness and frankness exist in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
31.	To what extent are other council members willing to listen to your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
32.	To what extent do UPC members solve problems well?	1	2	3	4	5
33.	To what extent do your committee members (if any) know what their jobs are and how to do them well?	1	2	3	4	5
34.	In general, to what extent do you have confidence and trust in other UPC chairpersons?	1	2	3	4	5
35.	To what extent is your advisor willing to listen to your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
36.	To what extent do other council members offer each other new ideas for solving job-related problems?	1	2	3	4	5

Note: Read these items over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions using the following scales:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Most of the time
5. Always

37. To what extent does your advisor do things for you as opposed to with you?	1	2	3	4	5
38. To what extent do other council members encourage each other to give their best effort?	1	2	3	4	5
39. To what extent does your advisor encourage council members to work as a team?	1	2	3	4	5
40. All in all, how satisfied are you with your advisor?	1	2	3	4	5
41. All in all, how satisfied are you with your work in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
42. Considering your skills and effort you put into planning programs, how satisfied are you with the rewards you receive?	1	2	3	4	5
43. How satisfied do you feel with the knowledge you have gained in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5
44. When you talk with other council members, to what extent do they pay attention to what you're saying?	1	2	3	4	5
45. To what extent is your advisor willing to listen to your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
46. To what extent do you look forward to coming to UPC meetings each week?	1	2	3	4	5
47. To what extent do you feel you have an opportunity to contribute to decisions made in UPC?	1	2	3	4	5

Note: Read these items over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions using the following scales:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Most of the time
5. Always

48. When you talk with your advisor, to what extent does s(he) pay attention to what you are saying? 1 2 3 4 5

49. On the basis of your experience how would you rate UPC on effectiveness, compared to other campus organizations?

UPC does an excellent job ___
Very Good ___
Good ___
Fair ___
UPC does a rather poor job ___

50. In general, which of the following best describes the manner in which problems are resolved in UPC?

___Little is done about these problems--they continue to exist
___Little is done about these problems--they work themselves out with time
___The problems are appealed to staff advisors in UPC--but are still not resolved
___The problems are appealed to staff advisors in UPC--and are usually resolved there
___The problems are handled by council members themselves and are usually resolved there
___The problems are handled jointly by council members and staff advisors and are usually resolved

51. If you have committee members, how well planned are the work assignments of these people?

___Extremely well planned
___Very well planned
___Fairly well planned
___Not so well planned
___Not so well planned at all
___No committee members

52. What are some things that you <u>like best</u> about UPC? (Please jot them down below):

53. What are some things that you <u>like least</u>, if any, about UPC?

54. If you could <u>change</u> anything about the way things are done in UPC, as a whole, what things (if any) would you like to see done differently?

55. Are there any additional comments you wish to make about UPC in general? (If so, please write below):

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

ORGANIZATIONAL AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT
Union Program Council

Name: _____

Title: _____

I. Introduction: Confidential/Frank & Honest/Divided into Sections

II. Orientation:

1. Your primary responsibilities? Any recent changes? Any desired changes?

2. Total employment here? Length in current position?

3. Prior job? Prior training?

4. Total number of people under your supervision?

5. Are UPC Staff/Student Responsibilities as outlined adhered to? Are By-Laws regarding positions followed? How well?

III. Relationship To External Organizations and Groups

1. Faculty?

2. University Administration?

3. Other student organizations? ASUN?

4. Estimate total funds UPC is responsible for? Sources?

5. Any problems or conflicts of interest with these organizations?

OAD-UPC-2

IV. Objectives, Goals & Criteria:

1. Besides written statement, any additional unwritten goals you perceive UPC has?

2. Broadly speaking, what assets (sources of input) exist to achieve these goals?

3. Your own personal goals? Obstacles to achieving them?

4. Is UPC effectively meeting its goals? How do you know? (Criteria?)

5. Identify 2-3 things you are not totally satisfied with in terms of goal achievement?

V. Current & Forseen Problems; Changes:

1. What things do you like in UPC as a whole?

2. Do you anticipate any necessary changes in the future which might require you to adapt or cope in some way? Organizationally? Personally?

3. Do some problems repeat themselves?

4. Pressures in your job? If possible, how would you alleviate?

VI. Decision-Making Processes:

1. Do you feel alone in your job at times?

2. Three major decisions UPC made this year?

3. How much real input do you feel you have?

4. Do you feel you should have more or less input? Why?

OAD-UPC-3

5. What kinds of information assist UPC in deciding what programs to offer?

6. What information do you lack? Why?

VII. Reward Structure: (Given UPC is volunteer organization)

1. How is one rewarded for services performed?

2. Punishments?

3. What affects your ability to perform to expectations? (probe positive & negative)

4. What affects your willingness or motivation to get job done?

VIII. Interpersonal Relationships

1. Describe your relationships to colleagues? Others?

2. With pressure to get things done, how do you deal with people problems?

3. Do you swallow frustrations or bring them up with people in the middle of other things?

4. How do you grow or advance in UPC and your job?

5. When problems arise, are people involved with you too willing to let you make the decision for them?

6. Are you comfortable? Are others? (Climate?)

IX. Time Management:

1. Hours you work weekly? Would you like to spend more? Less? How?

2. Reactions to weekly UPC meetings? (Specifically, Event Evaluation Reports/Committee Progress Reports/and format or agendas)

FEEDBACK RESULTS

From:

Dear UPC Members:

To this point we have:

1. Held interviews with all UPC staff and a random sample of UPC members

2. Received a total of 19 diagnostic questionnaires and tabulated the results

3. Compiled comments from both open-ended questionnaire items and taped interviews

These results are organized in this booklet as follows:

1. Questionnaire items and responses were roughly divided into seven categories

2. Comments from both open-ended questionnaire items and taped interviews appear after each category

3. Finally, three questions which pertain to your analysis of these results are specified for your consideration

*CATEGORIES

I. Climate

   a. structure
   b. goals, objectives, and criteria
   c. rewards
   d. cohesion and unity
   e. general

II. Relationships with Advisors

III. Relationships with others -- chairpersons & leadership -- on UPC level (inter-unit)

IV. Relationships within committees and leadership (intra-unit)

V. Decision-making and Problem Solving

   a. general
   b. program evaluation

VI. Improved work methods/orientation

VII. Time, meetings, and budget considerations

* These category labels did not appear on the actual diagnostic questionnaire. Furthermore, order of items were randomized on the actual diagnostic instrument to avoid "ordered effects" and systematic biases.

USED IN FEEDBACK SESSIONS

Please respond to the following questions before we get together this week because it will save us all a lot of time.

In addition, please do not discuss your observations or responses to these questions with anyone else at the present time. The rationale for this is simply that it is extremely important to independently generate diverse ideas and suggestions for decision-making purposes. Then, when we get together this week, we can "pool" our observations in order to arrive at the best possible solutions.

When you examine this new data, try to identify patterns which seem to emerge from all this. In general, your analysis of this data should focus on the following questions:

1. Where are we now as an organization?

2. Where would we like to be?

3. And, how do we get there?

Specifically, please address yourself to the following questions:

1. What areas would we (UPC) like to improve or strengthen? (List and briefly explain these objectives below):

2. Are any of the previously identified objectives worth our time and attention? If so, why? (i.e., are the "costs" incurred sufficient to merit our consideration).

3. Finally, how do we accomplish these objectives? What is it going to take to get us there?

	Potential Advantages	Potential Disadvantages
1. Area to be improved: _____ Suggestions & Alternatives:		
2. Area to be improved: _____ Suggestions & Alternatives:		
3. Area to be improved: _____ Suggestions & Alternatives:		

SUMMARY REPORT

ORGANIZATIONAL AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT

This report is designed to summarize major areas of agreement and disagreement between members and staff advisors of the Union Program Council during Organizational Awareness and Development sessions held November and December, 1975. With each group, member and staff advisors, significant areas of concern were derived from results of personal interviews and diagnostic questionnaires which had been distributed to all involved. These areas of concern were (1) evaluated as to their potential harms, (2) behaviors within UPC were examined as reinforcers for these areas of concern, and (3) some tenative solutions were finally proposed. As the data is further examined, it is wise to recall that organizational decisions always consist of tradeoffs and any course of action will yield both advantages and disadvantages to the organization involved. This cautionary remark should not deter constructive change, but neither should any group feel compelled to embark on any course of change as a panacea. Such panaceas rarely exist in human, task-oriented groups.

Areas of Concern

Cohesiveness

The most often mentioned area of concern was that a general lack of cohesiveness existed among UPC members. While this is perhaps to be expected in as large and diverse an organization as UPC, both members and staff advisors expressed a feeling that several harms stem from this situation. Among these it was felt that misunderstanding increased between chairpersons, while communication, productivity, initiative, interdependence, and mutual support are all decreased. These in turn act to offset potential increases in program quality and may even serve to decrease input into UPC programming. Dull meetings and loss of some fun and interest may also be spin-offs of this general problem area.

Lack of cohesiveness, however, may go hand in hand with the specialization needed to make UPC work. The gains have to be balanced against the losses in light of alternative ways of doing the same things. One way to analyze such alternatives is to examine aspects of UPC's operations which reinforce lack of member cohesion. Reinforcers can then be modified to produce change. Reinforcers for lack of cohesion, noted in our sessions, were lack of well defined, measurable, common goals; a structure which emphasized individual committees; expertise of chairpersons in specialized areas; lack of time, perhaps due to overextension with other campus organizations; the member selection process which emphasizes committees; and annual budgeting procedures which again stress individual committees.

Some staff felt that their own specialization might further influence members to specialize and thereby decrease cohesion. It was also proposed by the staff that their own willingness to intervene in committee functions, which were going poorly, might lead to less chairperson reliance upon other UPC members. Neither of these feelings were widely supported by the members in their sessions.

Advisor/Member Relationships -- Member Initiative

A second major area of concern was approached as "low member initiative" by the staff and "advisor/member relationships" by members. For the purposes of this report, these concerns are essentially over the same situation.

Members saw harms accruing from this as including a decrease in creativity, assertiveness, personal experience, and committee responsibility. Meanwhile, defensiveness, program dollar risk, and advisor work load all increase. Both groups also saw that a chairperson's self-confidence is affected as a cyclical pattern between decreasing-member-initiative and increasing-advisor-input develops. This cycle interferes with and threatens UPC's success during the present, and can even have long-range effects on member attrition and program quality.

This situation is reinforced when advisors do too many things for chairpersons, and the chairpersons let them do so. Ultimately, other chairpersons cannot make successful input on event discussions since they generally feel they have made no previous contribution and therefore should not evaluate others. In general, member knowledge about both the tasks and their roles is perceived as being limited and advisor expertise continues to be seen as prominent. As advisor expertise grows in the eyes of the members, members are less compelled to do things on their own.

Committees

Both groups again agreed that the strength of UPC committees, in general, left something to be desired. Interlocking with other areas of concern, weak committees tend to limit student input, student body support, learning, recruitment of new chairpersons, and program quality while increasing chairperson and advisor work loads. While members did not discuss reinforcers of weak committees, staff advisors saw this problem as being reinforced by such things as lack of time by members, advisor willingness to intervene, scheduling difficulties, event evaluations not being made within committees, and task monotony in some cases like the record lending library. It was also noted that while committees are "on-going" in structure, most begin anew under new chairpersons each year. This lack of carry-over, too, adds to weakened committees.

Dull Meetings

There was some consensus, particularly in the staff advisor group, that members perceive that meetings waste their time, are boring, decrease initiative, and generally exacerbates other areas of concern about UPC. Specific reinforcers were listed as member overinvolvement in other activities, failures within orientation, low member cohesion, and event evaluations being poorly handled.

Orientation/Workshops

Again, while people were generally positive toward both orientation and workshop sessions, they seem to be less effective, relevant, and more poorly attended than they could become. Reinforcing this seems to be that committee members are not involved in running them, people are more interested in orientation as a chance to get to know others than as an additional learning experience, problems discussed in workshops and orientation are not immediately relevant to the members participating, and they are often oriented towards what to do, rather than how to do it.

Executive Body

Only discussed by advisors, there was general consensus that the President and Executive Body should be relied upon more for getting UPC to establish its own policies, and run its own programs. This was seen as further serving to reduce staff involvement and increase member initiative.

Goals/Functions

As members pointed out, several of the previously mentioned areas of concern can be traced to UPC goals which are, at times, all too unclear. Coupled with the "role uncertainty" felt by some members, this can lead to lessened cohesion, efficiency, and effectiveness while confusion builds and advisors are subsequently relied upon too heavily.

Final Remarks

This report, while trying to do brief, but full coverage of areas of concern, their harms, and their reinforcers, has deliberately ignored solutions. While problem analysis is perhaps properly placed in the realm where an organization could seek outside advice, solution generation and evaluation is clearly the domain of the organization and its members alone.

Certainly, some of these situations discussed here suggest some easy ways to improve UPC operations. Orientation sessions could be improved by increased input and even, upon occasion, being conducted by members themselves. The focus of event evaluations should be individual committees, not UPC meetings. Meetings should have more clearly specified purposes, goals and roles should be clearly articulated, and the UPC President should be relied upon more by the staff.

On the other hand, most of these solutions only treat symptoms. The bigger problems will take some detailed analysis and debate treating such questions as how can members be rewarded for taking more initiative, where does staff responsibility to the University and staff responsibility to UPC members leave room for UPC member initiative, how can committees be better developed, and what structure is best for UPC to obtain its goals? This promises to be a big challenge for UPC during the year ahead. If OAD work has helped define the issues, it will have served its purpose well.